



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 101 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 3, 1955 No. 133

Senate

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Thursday, August 25, 1955. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

[Continuation of the proceedings of the Senate of Tuesday, August 2, 1955]

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY NO LONGER TAX EXEMPT

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.
Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Only for a question.
Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes, without the Senator from Oregon losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article written by Clark Mollenhoff, as it appeared in today's Des Moines Register, which article is entitled "Contributions to the Democratic Party No Longer Tax Exempt."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO DEMOCRATIC PARTY NO LONGER TAX EXEMPT

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Welburn S. Mayock, former attorney for the Democratic National Committee, was in a \$69,000 tax jam with the Republican administration Monday.

The 63-year-old Washington lawyer is charged with having failed to report more than \$115,000 income over a period of 6 years.

Among other things, the dispute involves Mayock's handling of a \$65,000 cash fee he received in 1948 to get the cooperation of John W. Snyder, former Secretary of the Treasury, on "a questionable tax ruling" for a New York firm.

Mayock has testified that he regarded \$35,000 of the money he collected from the William S. Lasdon tax case as a legal fee for his work before the Treasury Department. He said that it was understood with Lasdon that \$30,000 of the money was to be regarded as a contribution to the near empty Democratic campaign fund in September 1948.

The tax dispute became public Monday after Mayock filed 3 petitions in the United States Tax Court disputing the Internal Revenue Service claim that he owes \$69,396.10 in Federal taxes and fraud penalties for the years 1948 through 1953.

In May, Commissioner of Internal Revenue T. Coleman Andrews notified Mayock that the additional tax and penalties would be assessed if he did not file a contest in the United States Tax Court.

Mayock stated in his petition that his tax returns were "not false, were not fraudulent and were not made . . . with the intent to evade tax."

Tax officials contend that Mayock and his wife paid \$10,000 in taxes in the 6-year period involved in the dispute. Tax officials contend that if he had reported all of his income their correct tax would have been more than \$50,000 in this period.

The greatest single item in the dispute covered the year 1948. Tax officials have increased Mayock's business income by \$58,944.19 for that year.

Since Mayock, and his wife, Barbara, then residents of California filed separate tax re-

turns that year the tax officials added \$29,472.10 to the income of Mayock and his wife.

Mayock has been under fire since early in 1953 when the House Ways and Means Subcommittee made an investigation of how the Bureau of Internal Revenue had abandoned precedent to make a tax ruling that would save Lasdon several million dollars.

Other attorneys were unsuccessful in getting the Internal Revenue Service to give Lasdon a favorable ruling, but when Mayock called on Secretary Snyder it set the wheels in motion for the ruling.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has been extremely critical of the role that Mayock played in that case and has urged that the Internal Revenue Service tax Mayock on the entire \$30,000.

"Mayock without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer, but solely in his capacity as chief counsel for the Democratic National Committee, . . . contacted John Snyder, the Secretary of Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling of Mr. Lasdon's tax question," WILLIAMS told the Senate earlier this year.

"In return for obtaining this favorable ruling which would save nearly \$7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a \$65,000 cash fee with the understanding that \$30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee," WILLIAMS said.

WILLIAMS said that Mayock then took the \$30,000 "not money" and put it in the Democratic campaign by arranging for his friends to write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash.

The Delaware Senator had attacked the "callousness of the political regime" of the Truman administration, in then allowing Mayock "to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income tax return only \$17,500 of this \$65,000 fee."

"Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the \$30,000 set aside for the Democratic National Committee," WILLIAMS said.

Lasdon also deducted from the gross fee another \$17,500 which he said he gave to New York men, William Solom and Louis Markus, who had contacted him on the case. Both of these men denied that they had been paid any money.

The petitions filed in the United States Tax Court show that the Republican controlled Internal Revenue Service is now following WILLIAMS' suggestion, and is ruling that the entire \$65,000 is taxable to Mayock.

Here is a breakdown on income reported by Mayock and his wife and the figures that tax officials say they should have reported:

	Mayocks reported—	Tax officials' figures on corrected income
1948.....	\$17,777.38	\$77,136.66
1949.....	8,865.50	14,874.28
1950.....	11,411.11	25,489.55
1951.....	6,474.06	23,797.36
1952.....	7,190.92	19,037.67
1953.....	4,886.15	8,706.36

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 8, 1955, I called attention to how Mr. Welburn Mayock, former attorney for the Democratic National Committee, had, during the 1948 campaign, accepted \$65,000 as a fee from a New York businessman, with the understanding that he could get a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department.

The record showed that at that time he took \$35,000 of that fee paid into the Democratic National Committee, and did not pay any tax on it, on the basis that such a fee to the Democratic Party was not taxable. Therefore, for the first time in history, we had a situation where a political campaign was being financed indirectly out of the Treasury of the United States.

That ruling was obviously granted at that time by top officials in the Treasury Department on the basis that it was a party matter, in the same way in which other rulings were made involving Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Field, to which attention has been called.

The whole country was shocked at the low state of morals which existed at that time in the departments which would stoop to issue rulings on a favorable basis, that could be purchased by contributions to the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement on this subject which I made in the Senate Chamber on February 8 of this year, printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on August 4, 1953, Mr. Welburn Mayock, an attorney in Washington, D. C., was testifying before the Kean subcommittee. At that time the Kean committee was investigating the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue.

In his testimony of that date Mr. Mayock explained how in 1948, while serving as the chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, he had entered into an agreement with Mr. William S. Lasdon, Katonah, New York, whereby he was to obtain for Mr. Lasdon a favorable ruling from the Treasury Department on his then pending tax case.

In return for obtaining this favorable ruling which would save nearly \$7 million for Mr. Lasdon, Mr. Mayock was to receive a \$65,000 cash fee with the understanding that \$30,000 of this amount was to go to the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Mayock without any power of attorney to represent this taxpayer but solely in his capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee then contacted Mr. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of Treasury, and promptly obtained the favorable ruling on Mr. Lasdon's tax question.

Mr. Lasdon previously had been denied a favorable decision upon this same question by the Treasury Department.

After this tax-fix scheme had been arranged and after Mr. Mayock had collected \$65,000 fee, he was confronted with the

problem of how to get the \$30,000 into the Democratic campaign fund without obviously violating the Hatch Act. (The Hatch Act prohibits contributions to a political campaign in excess of \$5,000 by any one individual.)

However, once having agreed to fix a tax case for \$65,000 the question of violating the Hatch Act apparently was not bothersome to Mr. Mayock and his associates.

Accordingly, as Mr. Mayock explained it, he merely arranged to have some of his friends write their personal checks payable to the Democratic National Committee in exchange for an equivalent amount of cash. In this manner he siphoned this \$30,000 of "hot money" into the treasury of the Democratic National Committee.

While freely admitting all of the above transactions during his testimony before the Kean subcommittee under date of August 4, 1953, Mr. Mayock flatly refused to tell that committee the names of the individuals who cooperated in this underhanded method of financing a political campaign. Each time the committee pressed him for the names of these individuals Mr. Mayock replied, "That I am going to refuse to answer."

Since Mr. Mayock was reluctant to publish the names of the individuals who exchanged their personal checks payable to the National Committee for an equivalent amount of this "tax-fix fee," I shall read that list to the Senate along with a breakdown of the amount handled by each individual plus the dates of the transactions.

Date	Name and address	Amount
Oct. 13, 1948	Democratic County Central Committee, William H. Malone, Chairman, 955 Mills Tower, San Francisco.....	\$10,000
Oct. 14, 1948	Harold A. Berliner, 10 Crown Ter., San Francisco.....	5,000
Do.....	William J. Mahaney, 2412 Russ Bldg., San Francisco.....	5,000
Oct. 18, 1948	Roy G. Owens, 1204 South Hill St., Los Angeles.....	2,500
Do.....	Willis Allen, 634 North Cherokee Ave., Los Angeles.....	2,500
Do.....	William B. Feiler, 7133 Sunset Blvd., Hollywood.....	2,500
Do.....	Lawrence W. Allen, 2104 North Highland Ave., Hollywood.....	2,500
	Total.....	30,000

This was not the only time that the Treasury Department, under the New Deal administration resorted to the issuance of questionable rulings for the purpose of financing the 1948 political campaign.

On April 29, 1953, I incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of a series of political rulings which had been issued by the Treasury Department while Mr. John W. Snyder was Secretary of the Treasury, wherein Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, Winston-Salem, N. C., Mr. Marshall Field, and Mr. David A. Schulte, both of New York City, were permitted to charge off as bad business debts their approximately \$400,000 contributions to the 1948 Democratic campaign.

Since incorporating those rulings in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I have discovered that this same Mr. Welburn Mayock was one of prime factors behind those rulings.

On December 17, 1948, Mr. Mayock, without any power of attorney to represent Mr. Reynolds or the others involved but solely in his official capacity as chief counsel of the Democratic National Committee, held a conference with Mr. Edward H. Foley, Under Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Thomas J. Lynch, General Counsel of the Treasury Department. At that meeting they discussed the Richard W. Reynolds case, which involved a \$300,000 contribution to the Democratic Party, as a party case and arranged for the issuance of a favorable ruling allowing

him to write off this contribution as a bad business loan.

As further evidence of the callousness of the political regime then in power we find that the Treasury Department even permitted Mr. Mayock to get away with reporting on his 1948 Federal income-tax returns only \$17,500 of this \$65,000 fee collected from Mr. Lasdon. Before computing his taxes he was permitted to deduct from the fee the \$30,000 which he set aside for the Democratic National Committee. He deducted from the gross fee another \$17,500 solely upon his claim that he paid \$8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon, 275 Central Park West, New York City, and Mr. Louis Markus, 9445 86th Road, Woodhaven, Long Island, as their share of the tax-fix payoff.

This latter deduction was allowed notwithstanding the fact that when both Mr. Markus and Mr. Solomon testified under oath (August 5, 1953) before the Kean subcommittee, they emphatically denied that they had received any of this fee, and accordingly they had paid no taxes on their alleged share.

But the mere fact that no one was paying any tax on this \$17,500 in controversy did not in the least bother the Treasury Department. They merely placed it in the same category as the \$30,000 contribution to the Democratic National Committee and allowed everybody to write it off their tax returns.

This procedure of issuing favorable Treasury rulings in exchange for contributions to a political party was extremely costly to the American taxpayers from two angles:

First, the granting of these favorable rulings which apparently would not otherwise have been extended resulted in a substantial loss in revenue.

Second, the issuance of these rulings had the indirect effect of financing a part of the 1948 Democratic campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

The disclosure of these transactions was a shock to the American people and the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party were just as indignant as were the members of the Republican Party to find that certain high officials in that administration had stooped to such low tactics for the purpose of financing a political campaign.

Even after publishing the additional list of names of those involved in this deal there are still many questions left unanswered in this case, and I suggest that both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department reexamine the conflicting testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in August 1953.

For instance, the conflict of testimony wherein Mr. Mayock under oath told the committee that he paid \$8,750 each to Mr. William Solomon and Mr. Louis Marcus and their testimony of the following day emphatically denying this statement obviously is the basis of a perjury charge.

The statute of limitations may have expired on violations of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1948, but it has not expired on any possible perjury charges resulting from testimony given before the Kean subcommittee in 1953, nor has it expired upon the ability of the Treasury Department to collect back taxes due on the erroneous deduction of the \$30,000 fee to the Democratic National Committee as well as the controversial \$17,500 referred to above.

Grand juries are now in session at both Omaha and St. Louis, and their work should shed additional light upon the scandal-ridden tax bureau of that era.

THE EXECUTIVE PAY BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since I had the floor before and yielded it, I have been educated on the executive pay

1955

bill—and some education it has been. In fact, I owe a great deal to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and to others of my colleagues in the Senate for informing me as to what has happened in regard to the executive pay bill.

In the rush of the work of the Senate, I was of the understanding that we had a bill here which was ready to be passed, and I assumed that it would follow the regular parliamentary procedures. But I have discovered that it is a bill which the President sent to Congress only a few days ago. It is a bill on which there have been no hearings. It is a bill, I understand, which is pocked with discriminations and unfairness. It is a bill which, if passed in its present form, will result in the setting of pay scales in certain instances that can never be corrected, so far as the injustice done to others is concerned, unless a whole group of people are subsequently raised to higher pay levels.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator discussing the sugar bill or the pay bill?

Mr. MORSE. I am discussing the pay bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It sounds to me like the sugar bill.

Mr. MORSE. It is simply sugar-coated; that is all.

Again, as is always my practice, I shall deal frankly in what I am about to say. A number of colleagues have said to me, "WAYNE, it should not pass." That is up to them; and because we can change it from "It should not pass" into "It shall not pass," if cooperation be extended, and although I have been speaking half jocularly, I now speak in dead earnestness, I think it should not pass. I do not think that in the closing hours of this session we should pass an executive pay bill on which no hearings have been held and about which I have heard so much complaint as I have heard in the last half hour since the Senator from Georgia, and very rightly so, I may say—I take no offense at all; I think he followed a very sound parliamentary procedure—objected to the consideration of the executive pay bill under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Therefore, I think it is more important that I talk about the educational plight of America's children rather than that I should permit the passage of the executive pay bill, on which there have been no hearings, and about which I can find no enthusiasm on this side of the aisle, at least, in regard, particularly, to the procedures which have been adopted.

I did not talk to them, but I understand some representatives of the executive branch of the Government, who might be called Government lobbyists, have been at the Capitol for the last few days, buttonholing and discussing the matter with Senators, urging that the bill be passed in this highly, I think, irregular way.

I do not like it. The only difference is that I think such matters ought to be discussed on the floor of the Senate, and not merely in the cloakroom.

bill is as bad as I understand it to be, it should be prevented from passing tonight, and certainly it ought to be prevented from passing if the procedures which have been followed or the procedures which the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], has stated, namely, that there have been no hearings, and no witnesses have testified, and no opportunity has been afforded to sit down and iron out the unfair discriminations which are contained in the executive pay bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say that I do not think that we should pass the bill. If the Senator from Georgia will excuse me for a moment longer, I think we can correct any injustice which our failure to pass the bill tonight may create, come January. Then we can pass the bill after hearings have been held, and we can make the terms of the bill retroactive in order to correct any unfairness which any particular individual may suffer as a result of not passing the bill tonight.

But it is not my fault that the administration did not send the bill to us earlier. It is not the fault of the Senator from Georgia that the administration did not send it here earlier, so that hearings could be held.

I am simply opposed to this kind of parliamentary procedure. I am going to talk about the educational needs of America's schoolchildren, whom we have not been taking care of. I think it is more important that we take care of the educational needs of America's schoolchildren than that the administrative assistants on the White House staff should receive \$22,500 a year salary.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. No, not at this time. I am going to discuss the plight of America's schoolchildren for a while.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Oregon mentioned my name. I am certain he will be generous and yield to me.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him without losing my right to the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to say that my objection to the bill was not based on a fundamental objection to an increase in salaries in the executive branch of the Government. I well realize that there may be substantial increases in compensation for some of those in administrative posts. I have glanced at the bill. As I say, there have been no hearings.

I notice, for example, the very important position of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The occupant of that office is charged with the responsibility of collecting about \$60 billion

which is used to pay the salaries of all the employees of the Government. His position was classified with the lowest of the assistant postmasters general. It seems to me that that was a very unfair provision for a man who is charged with the great responsibility of preventing frauds and of keeping tax collections moving. That is one position I happened to observe.

I do not think it would be right to pass a bill that might enforce inequities of that nature into the statutes of the United States, particularly when there have been no hearings, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out.

I thank the Senator for allowing me to clarify my position.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I always want to extend courtesy to the Senator from Kansas. If he will protect my right to the floor by asking unanimous consent that I do not lose the floor, I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me for a few minutes, without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon.

I sincerely hope that an executive pay bill can be approved at this session of Congress. Congress has voted increases in pay for Members of Congress. We have voted increases in pay for the legislative branch of the Government. We have voted increases totaling \$700 million for the salaried employees of the Government. Congress has voted increases of \$200 million for the postal employees of the Nation, and \$300 million for the classified workers of the Government.

Now we are asked in the closing hours of this session to vote \$1,500,000 for increases in pay for the executive branch of the Government. Frankly, I do not think it is fair to ask the executive branch of the Government to operate on their present basis.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will permit us to proceed at this time with the bill. I do not think there would be any difficulty in approving the proposed legislation, because the Senate might take the House bill, adopt it with some amendments, send it back to the House, and I am advised the House would accept it.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Georgia are absolutely correct when they say there were no hearings. The bill came to the Senate on July 15. It was not the fault of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or of the ranking minority member, or of any other member. Frankly, I wish the bill had come to the Senate before that date, but that is the situation.

The President sent a letter to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and asked for the proposed legislation. We have tried to comply with that request, and I sincerely hope the Congress

will not adjourn without passing the bill. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator, and I wish to make a very brief reply to him. The other salary increases to which he has referred were arrived at as a result of studies of a special commission appointed by the Congress to go into the matter. There were long and substantial hearings on that question. The other increases to which the Senator has referred were all the result of congressional hearings. A thorough record was made. That does not happen to be true in this case.

I do not blame the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or the ranking Republican member of the committee for the fact that hearings were not held, because we did not get the bill in time to have hearings, and the Senator is not responsible for the fact that the bill did not come in time. The executive branch of the government, which wants the increases, must assume that responsibility, and it should wait until January so Congress can go into the matter and see to it that it tries to protect the taxpayers' interest.

I do not know of any better public service I can render in the closing hours of the session than to do what I can, and I understand I am going to be assisted by other Senators, to prevent a vote on the measure, until Congress can have time, when it convenes in January, to go into the matter.

I am very sorry for the plight in which the schoolchildren find themselves because of the failure of Congress to enact legislation to assist our educational system. I think it is more important for Congress to provide for adequate educational facilities than to provide for higher salaries for certain Government officials.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield only if I am protected from losing my right to the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a 2-minute statement with reference to the comments of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senate ought to know that a number of Senators, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, have discussed the executive pay bill, not privately, but collectively. It would be sheer folly to assume that an executive pay bill of these dimensions and proportions would pass the Senate tonight, or even tomorrow.

I think it is only fair to say that when an attempt is being made to revise the entire pay schedule of a branch of the Government, it is rather insulting to that branch not to give it the consideration of polite testimony or hearing.

We have had several experiences in which Congress has legislated in a hurry in this manner. Every time that has been done, Congress has found those

matters troublesome and has been involved in difficulty.

I wish to remind the Senate that last year it passed a pay bill for postal workers, after hearings. The bill was vetoed. The Senate passed a postal pay bill this year, after more hearings, and it was vetoed.

I remind my colleagues that the executive branch has had a pay increase. I do not say one is not needed, but one was granted some time ago, in about 1951, I believe it was. Since that time, if it had been thought that there was a great need for pay increases, there have been almost 3 years—some 31 months—in which the practical suggestion of a pay increase could have been made.

Furthermore, I think it should be noted that the executive branch of the Government is spawning like fish in the spawning beds of rivers. There are more and more assistant secretaries, more and more bureau chiefs, more and more everything, with more and more pay. It appears to me that if new titles are to be provided, if salary schedules are to be expanded, if the entire pay schedule is to be expanded, then Congress should have time to study the matter.

I wish to join with the Senator from Oregon, and say that if there is to be an executive pay bill passed, Congress ought to make up its mind to stay in session to see that a legislative job is done properly.

We need roads before we need pay raises. We need schools before we need pay increases in some particular job most of us have not even heard of. We will be needing social security for persons who have not had their pay increased by this Congress, too.

I join with the Senator and say at this hour I always feel better, too. I shall be delighted to join in whatever efforts will be necessary to prevent the passage of this particular measure.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator. Knowing him, I know the volumes he can speak on this subject, and I shall stay with him even after I get through, because I would not know to miss the contributions which I am sure he will make to this record before we get through with the discussion.

I am particularly concerned now about the plight of the American schoolchildren [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join with the Senator in that concern.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make a record with regard to the educational needs of the country, in the hope that between now and January each Member of Congress will resolve to come back to Congress and enact legislation which will help protect one of the greatest sources of America's power, namely, the development of the brains of our children.

I wish to repeat what the Senator from Minnesota heard me say in Minnesota, when he and I appeared on a platform together there not so long ago.

We need always to keep in mind that great statement of Thomas Jefferson, namely, that the strength of our democracy can be no greater than the enlightenment of its people, and the enlighten-

ment of its people depends more on adequate support of the school system of America than on any other one factor.

I think it is time that the Congress and the executive branch of the Government devoted themselves to legislation which will strengthen financial support for the schoolchildren of America. I am going to proceed to discuss that situation.

COMPENSATION OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF SENATE PRESS, RADIO, AND PERIODICAL GALLERIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—
Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the Senator from Oregon yield, to permit the introduction of a joint resolution, if unanimous consent is obtained that he will retain all his rights to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; if nothing in the joint resolution would result in taking me off the floor.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I assure my friend that the joint resolution does not contain anything of that sort.

Mr. MORSE. Very well; I shall yield for that purpose, if I am amply protected.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me with that understanding and for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I introduce a joint resolution providing for compensation for the superintendents of the Senate press, radio, and periodical galleries; and I request the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104), which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956) effective August 1, 1955, the basic annual compensation of the following positions under the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall be: Superintendent, press gallery, \$5,300; first assistant superintendent, press gallery, \$4,700; second assistant superintendent, press gallery, \$3,800; third assistant superintendent, press gallery, \$3,300; fourth assistant superintendent, press gallery, \$2,580; secretary, press gallery, \$2,100; superintendent, radio press gallery, \$5,200; first assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, \$4,000; second assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, \$3,500; third assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, \$3,000; and superintendent, periodical press gallery, \$4,300.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the joint resolution would affect—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, just a minute, please. Now that the joint resolution has been introduced and read, I wish to make certain that any ensuing debate or proceedings will be under the terms of the agreement protecting my rights to the floor.